

MEETING SUMMARY | April 30, 2014

Santa Rosa Plain Technical Advisory Committee

USGS Presentation Recap

The Project Team re-capped the USGS presentation from the April Basin Advisory Panel meeting. In preparing a presentation for the community forums, the TAC recommended that the Project Team describe both what the model is and is not, and be prepared to address model assumptions and the issue of uncertainty. A number of TAC members noted that the process of developing and using the model is more important at this stage than precise numbers describing inflow, outflow and the overall water budget. Looking to the future, the Basin Advisory Panel will explore and decide which management options get run through the model.

Review and Refinement of Executive Summary and GMP Section 2 (Water Resources)

The TAC reviewed and discussed the first draft narrative GMP Executive Summary. Members generally felt the document represented a strong first draft, yet also provided a range of feedback and suggestions, both to an annotated and abbreviated version. The TAC subsequently re-visited draft GMP section 2 (water resources) and focused discussion and minimal comments on the incorporation of USGS model results. The full draft GMP may be available for review by the TAC during its May meeting.

<http://www.scwa.gov/srgroundwater/>

Next TAC Meeting

Upcoming TAC Meeting Dates: October 23, 2013 at the Sonoma County Water Agency office, 404 Aviation Blvd, Santa Rosa.

Action Items

Timeframe	Name	Action Item
May 7	TAC Members	Submit comments on Executive Summary and GMP Section 2 to Project Team

Facilitator Rich Wilson opened the meeting and informed the group that, per the request of an absent TAC member, the meeting would be recorded. He briefly provided an update on community forums planning. Pam Kuhn followed with a status update on the development of various publicity materials designed to support the forums.

USGS Presentation Recap

Project Manager Marcus Trotta and Technical Specialist Tim Parker re-capped the USGS presentation from the April Basin Advisory Panel meeting. A range of questions came up, and discussion followed, focused on how to effectively share the conceptual model with the wider public during the community forums. Overall, the group recommended that the Project Team describe both what the model is and is not, and be prepared to address model assumptions and the issue of uncertainty. Some suggested a description of how the model

was calibrated to help address the issue of uncertainty related to model results. A number of TAC members noted that the process of developing and using the model is more important at this stage than precise numbers describing inflow, outflow and the overall water budget. Looking to the future, the Basin Advisory Panel will explore and decide which management options get run through the model. The group rounded out discussion by revisiting and refining key messages associated with the model results, which in turn were shared and then further refined at the May Panel meeting.

Introduction and Discussion of GMP Executive Summary

At its March meeting, the TAC discussed and refined a detailed outline for a GMP Executive Summary. The Project Team subsequently developed a draft narrative based on the agreed upon outline. Tim Parker introduced the narrative, described its content and structure, and opened up discussion. The TAC generally felt the document represented a strong first draft, yet also provided a range of feedback and suggestions, including the following:

- Provide a clear rationale and benefits (i.e. “why we are developing a GMP”)
- Balance redundancy with creation of a stand alone document
- Ensure information on storage change over time is accurate
- Ensure emphasis that model is tool to inform management and ensure safe yield
 - Qualification: it is a moving target and complex policy issue
 - “Sustainable water resources” is a simple term
 - Consider as part of “why we developed a GMP”
 - Consider level of detail re: reader understanding of conceptual model
- Be consistent in use of “basin” and “sub-basin”
 - Challenging given DWR classifications
- Some numerical detail may be too much (e.g. population statistics)
- Some action lists are redundant with management objectives—maybe details in actions can be merged with objectives
- Use footnotes (sparingly) or hyperlinks to point reader to more information
- Check maps for accuracy
- Maps can be used to show number and type of wells across region
 - Caution: model is overall wells for study area not total number of wells
- Be consistent with how BMOs and actions are listed
 - Put in table to fix issue
- Large water storage change number needs to be put in context
 - Support qualitatively
 - Move away from front
- General comment: Description of surface water/groundwater movement is difficult to understand
- General comment: Make as readable as possible
- Format issue: Use white space better to separate topics/issues (e.g. consider magazine or other friendly formats)

Conversation followed wherein the TAC discussed the content and structure of a 1-2 page Executive Summary for the general public. The groups suggested the following topics and issues should be included:

- Describe overarching goal and purpose of GMP
- Highlight the collaborative process that informed development of the draft GMP
- Relative to the conceptual model, present what it is, how developed and how it will inform management planning
 - USGS foundation may be separate
- Build on existing flyers (SRP and USGS)
 - Still need to highlight why do a groundwater management plan
- Include BMOs and recommended actions
 - Abbreviate instead of including narrative list
- Include information on how people can get involved
- Describe potential future after adoption
- Note how GMP fits into statewide Water Code

GMP Section 2 – Water Resources

Subsequent to the Executive Summary discussion, the TAC re-visited GMP section 2 (Water Resources). The TAC has closely review GMP section 2 on several occasions. Most recently, the Project Team provided an overview at the March TAC meeting as to how the USGS study results are incorporated. The TAC looked closely again at section 2, following the USGS presentation at the April Panel meeting, and provided the following minimal comments:

- Describe model and alert reader to results at chapter beginning
- 2-2 – Cite previous studies and note that USGS study is listed later in chapter
- Try to clarify terms like “estimate” and “simulate” for the lay reader
- Ensure all figures are aligned with narrative text
- 2.8.4 – Consider listing concepts/model in order (could describe as bookends or maybe in a little table)

TAC Meeting Attendees

TAC Members

Kevin Cullinen
 Matt O’Conner
 Michael Burns
 Jane Nielson
 Bob Anderson
 Mark Calhoon
 Andy Rich

Project Team

Project Manager, Marcus Trotta
 Technical Consultant, Tim Parker
 TAC Facilitator, Rich Wilson